

elevate and finally succeed in elevating to the Speaker's Chair a man who is regarded as the impersonation of Northern Abolitionism and sectional doctrines. Is this Americanism? Next, we find there a small body of men, some forty or thereabouts, professing to be the "Simon Pures" of the *American* party, one of whom says it is a principle of his party to proscribe men on account of their religious opinions, and another says it is not. One thinks citizens not native to the soil, should for ever be excluded from all offices of honor, profit or trust—another advances and advocates the contrary opinion. "Who shall decide when doctors disagree?"

Hear Mr. Eustis, one of these "Simon Pures," and a member of the House of Representatives from Louisiana. He, (Mr. Eustis,) in the course of his remarks in reply, on the 7th of January, 1856, to remarks made some days before by Mr. Bennett of Mississippi, said: "He would take occasion to state in a very few words, the position occupied by the *American party* of Louisiana on the subject of religion. That party in Louisiana held, and he hoped to God it would be so held in every State of this Union, as a cardinal maxim, that religious faith was a question between each individual and his God, and they considered *any attempt* to circumscribe or abridge religious freedom, was unworthy of our great country and a violation of the *organic law* of the land. With this spirit, the American Party of Louisiana had *repudiated the eighth article* of the Philadelphia Platform, and he now repudiated it *in toto*. He cared not what construction gentlemen in perfect good faith might be pleased to place upon that article. He knew that gentlemen had *said* that they meant nothing by that article—that the *construction* which they placed upon it could not be considered offensive to American Catholics, and that therefore it was inoperative. But the *words were there—they were in white and black*, and were *offensive and insulting* to American Catholics. If the *American Party* meant nothing by the eighth article, they should erase it from their platform, for it was a *blot* on the history of our country. That portion of their platform had driven thousands from their ranks who coincided with them in other respects; for the *American people* would never unite in a crusade against *American Catholics*. He would rather that his right arm should wither than be connected with any party whose purpose was to proscribe American Catholics in this great country. Gentlemen had talked about the Papal power. It made him blush when he saw the Protestant Church dragging its robes in the mire of politics. The Legislatures were full of gentlemen with black coats and white cravats, and even Congress contained gentlemen of that cloth."

These are excellent sentiments, and as he states that thousands